

## **REMARKS**

The present response accompanies a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Claims 49-58 and 60-65 are pending in the present application. Claims 49-58 and 60-65 are rejected. Claims 49, 51-56, 60, 62, 63 and 65 have been amended. Claim 64 has been canceled. Claims 1-48 and 59 were previously canceled. No claims have been added. Therefore, claims 49-58, 60-63 and 65 will be pending after entry of the foregoing amendments.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the time and attention afforded by Examiner Anwah during a telephonic interview on April 23, 2007. During the interview, Applicants' representative and Examiner Anwah discussed the cited references, the claimed invention, and the non-anticipatory and non-obvious nature of the claims in view of the references. Applicants' representative proposed amending the claims to further distinguish the claimed invention over the cited references. Examiner Anwah agreed to reconsider the application in view of the proposed amendments. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the claims as discussed during the telephonic interview.

Independent claims 49 and 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,130,938 ("Erb"). Independent claims 52 and 60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erb in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,423 ("Armstrong").

Claims 49, 52, 60 and 65 have been amended to incorporate a feature previously recited in dependent claim 64; namely, that one of the devices in the multi-networked environment is a set-top box. In addition, the claims recite receiving status information regarding the set-top box. With respect to claims 49, 52 and 60, the status information is received independently of receiving a request for establishing a communication session between a requester and a user. With respect to claim 65, the status information is received independently of receiving a request for the identify of a communication device at which the user can likely be reached.

Claim 64 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erb in view of Armstrong and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,825,862 ("Voit"). As acknowledged in the Office Action, Erb and Armstrong fail to disclose that one of the devices

in the multi-networked environment is a set-top box (*see* Office Action dated February 8, 2007 (“Office Action”) at § 7, p. 14). The Office Action contends, however, that Voit discloses the set-top box (*id.*). In contrast to the present claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the status information associated with Voit’s set-top box is received only after a call to a called party has been placed.

More specifically, Voit discloses a system for sending call related information to a customer’s set-top box (Voit at col. 6, ll. 19-22). In operation, a trigger is activated when a calling party makes a telephone call to the called party (*id.* at col. 9, ll. 61-62). A signal switching point (SSP) detects the trigger (*id.* at col. 9, ll. 62-63). The SSP composes and sends a query to a integrated service control point (ISCP) with the calling number of the incoming call (*id.* at col. 9, ll. 63-65). The ISCP is then informed, or asks a Level 1 gateway, whether the customer’s set-top box is active (*id.* at col. 10, ll. 11-15). If the set-top box is active, the ISCP sends a response message to the SSP (*id.* at col. 10, ll. 29-31). Upon receiving the message, the SSP processes the call by causing call related information to be displayed on the customer’s television (*id.* at col. 12, ll. 11-18). In other words, Voit’s ISCP receives information regarding the set-top box in response to a call being made to the called party.

Thus, Voit does not disclose, teach, or suggest receiving status information regarding a set-top box independent of receiving a request for establishing a communication session, as recited in claims 49, 52 and 60. Moreover, Voit does not disclose, teach, or suggest receiving the status information independent of receiving a request for the identity of a communication device at which a user can likely be reached, as recited in claim 65.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 49 and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and the rejection of claims 52 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), be withdrawn.

Claim 50 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erb in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,115,737 (“Ely”). Claims 51, 53-58, 62 and 63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erb in view of Armstrong. Claim 61 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erb in view of Armstrong and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,154,646 (“Tran”).

**DOCKET NO.:** CING-0385/567 (US)  
**Application No.:** 09/850,181  
**Office Action Dated:** February 8, 2007

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

As claims 50 and 51 depend from claim 49, claims 53-58 depend from claim 52, and claims 61-63 depend from claim 60, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 50, 51, 53-58 and 61-63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable and that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney, Bryan T. Giles at (215) 564-8954, to discuss the resolution of any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 8, 2007

/Bryan T. Giles/  
Bryan T. Giles  
Registration No. 60,078

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439